

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 42933/287781	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/IB2005/000297	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 07 February 2005 (07.02.2005)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 09 February 2004 (09.02.2004)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant NOKIA CORPORATION			

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I | Basis of the report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis.2).

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	Date of issuance of this report 14 August 2006 (14.08.2006)
	Authorized officer Cecile Chatel e-mail: pt13@wipo.int

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 14 JUN 2005

WIPO

PCT

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

Alston & Bird LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street,
Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
USA

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

08-06-2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference

42933/287781

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/000297

International filing date (day/month/year)

07-02-2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

09-02-2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

G06F 17/30

Applicant

Nokia Corporation et al

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further opinions, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/SE

Patent- och registreringsverket

Box 5055

S-102 42 STOCKHOLM

Facsimile No. +46 8 667 72 88

Authorized officer

Patrik Rydman/MN

Telephone No. +46 8 782 25 00

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/000297

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/000297

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	4-6, 8, 9, 20, 24	YES
	Claims	1-3, 7, 10-17, 19, 21-23, 25	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-25	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-25	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The invention according to the application aims at providing a system for multi-media file access which is more user-friendly than prior art.

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: WO, 02/057959, A2

D2: EP, 1051034, A1

D3: US, 2003/009493, A1

D4: WO, 99/37075, A1

Document D1 discloses (see page 8, line 4-13, page 12, line 4-13, claims 1-11 and figures 1, 3 and 6) an apparatus and a method for managing digital media files using a timeline. According to the method of document D1 a user may define a portion of a time line and thereby view enlarged representations of media files within the marked time. The multi media files are associated with metadata such as timestamps or other information about the content of the file, icons may be superimposed on the representations of the files.

The subject matter of claims 1, 2, 10-16, 21 and 22 is disclosed by document D1 and, therefore, lacks novelty (Article 33(2) PCT).

Document D2 discloses (see paragraph [0006] and figure 25) a device and a method for displaying multi media information according to which method images are classified according to time and an image at one time point is larger than an image

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/000297

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.
Continuation of: Box V

of another time point. The further away from the present time an image is, the smaller the image.

The subject matter of claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 14, 16-19, 21, 23 and 25 is disclosed by document D2 and is not novel (Article 33(2) PCT).

Document D3 discloses a method of organizing media files along a timeline.

Document D4 discloses (see page 10, lines 8-15) a method of displaying selectable information on a screen using a larger font than other information.

The subject matter of claims 4-6, 18 and 24 differs from what is disclosed by document D1, considered to best represent the prior art, only in that the media file representation is displayed in "pop-up" view format.

Said additional feature and its advantages is well known to the skilled person and he would include it in the apparatus and method of document D1 without inventive skill.

The invention according to claims 4-6, 18 and 24, therefore, does not involve an inventive step, (Article 33(3) PCT).

The subject matter of claims 8, 9 and 20 differs from what is disclosed by document D1 in that a media file representation closer to a center point or vertical centerline is larger than other media file representations proximate to the predefined position.

Said difference is considered not to solve a technical problem, but is merely of aesthetical relevance. Further, it is known from document D2 of the same technical field to let the size of the media representation decrease successively away from a time point representing the present.

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/000297

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: BOX V

The invention according to claims 8, 9 and 20 does not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

Therefore, the invention according to claims 1-3, 7, 10-17, 19, 21-23, 25 is not novel and the invention according to claims 4-6, 8, 9, 20, 24 is novel, but lacks an inventive step. The invention according to claims 1-25 is industrially applicable.